

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/774,549	Applicant(s) FURUKUWA, KEN	
	Examiner Rachel E. Beveridge	Art Unit 1725	

**All Participants:**

(1) Rachel E. Beveridge.

(2) Barry Shuman (50,220).

**Date of Interview:** 31 July 2006

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 16:30 EST

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
103(a) over Makoto et al. (JP406120634A)

Claims discussed:  
Claim 2

Prior art documents discussed:  
Makoto et al. (JP406120634A)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet


  

**Part III.**


☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**JONATHAN JOHNSON**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rachel Beveridge contacted Attorneys Laurence McClure (44,228) and Barry Shuman (50,220) regarding an examiner's amendment for claim 2 in order to overcome prior art. An agreement was reached between the Examiner and Attorney Barry Shuman regarding the proposed amendment..